

William M. Simpich, Esq., SB#106672
Law Offices of William M. Simpich
1736 Franklin Street, 10th Floor
Oakland, CA 94612
Telephone (510) 444-0226
Facsimile (510) 444-1704

Attorney for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO

PHILLIP MOCEK,)
)
Plaintiffs,)
)
v.)
)
CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE,)
ALBUQUERQUE AVIATION)
POLICE DEPARTMENT,)
MARSHALL KATZ, in his official)
capacity as Chief of Police of)
The Albuquerque Aviation Police)
Department, JONATHAN)
BREEDON, GERALD ROMERO)
ANTHONY SCHREINER,)
ROBERT F. DILLEY a/k/a BOBBY)
DILLEY, LANDRA WIGGINS,)
JULIO DE LA PENA, and DOES)
1-25 inclusive,)
)
Defendants,)
)
_____)

Case No. 11-1009-JB-KBM

**TABLE OF CONTENTS IN SUPPORT
OF PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO
DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS
AND REQUEST TO FILE AMENDED
COMPLAINT**

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
In the past, Mocek has flown by commercial air without needing to provide documentation of identity	1
Mocek declines to provide identification documents, films TSA and Albuquerque police officers, and is arrested	3
City defendants write a false criminal complaint and false incident reports	8
De La Pena’s supplemental incident report	10
Wiggins’s supplemental incident report	11
Mocek is arraigned on charges of disorderly conduct, concealing identification, refusing an officer’s order, and criminal trespass	12
Mocek returns to the airport to fetch his belongings and notices that his camera has been tampered with while in police custody	12
Mocek recovers deleted images and footage of the airport incident	13
Mocek is tried and acquitted in New Mexico state court	13
Consequences of the Defendants’ actions	14
Causes of Action	14
ARGUMENT	17
1. The City Defendants conducted a pretextual arrest and search	17
A. This conduct violated the Fourth Amendment	17
B. This conduct also violated Plaintiff’s 6th Amendment right to a fair trial	18
C. This conduct violated Plaintiff’s First Amendment rights	18
2. These facts also support Plaintiff’s claim for abuse of process	19
3. Even if there were no pretext, defendants would still be liable for the 1st and 4th Amendment violations	20
A. The Tobey case illustrates that Plaintiff’s conduct was non-disruptive and is protected in the airport screening context	20

1	B. The City Defendants' attempts to force Plaintiff to speak violates the 5th Amendment	21
2		
3	C. Although Plaintiff may be forced to provide his name, Plaintiff did provide it and Defendant Dilley lied about it	22
4		
5	4. Plaintiff is Confident that the Court Will Agree that the Law of the Case Doctrine is Inapplicable in Ruling on Defendant's Motion, as New Evidence is Presented that Was Inappropriate or Unavailable for the Federal Defendants' Motion	22
6		
7	5. Municipal Liability Claim Should Go Forward, As Unconstitutional Acts are Alleged	23
8		
9	6. Declaratory Relief Claim Should Go Forward, As Case is Not Moot	23
10		
11	7. Plaintiff Seeks Leave to Amend the Complaint	23

Dated: March 28, 2013

/s/
WILLIAM M SIMPICH

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28